

REPLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.111

In reply to the Official Action mailed on July 19, 2005, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the application and the various grounds of rejection set forth in the Official Action. Following is a discussion of the reasons why the several rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 6-8

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, and 6 to 8 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,128,825 (Cunkelman). The Applicant has reviewed the Cunkelman patent and believes that it fails to present a *prima facie* case of anticipation relative to any of Claims 1, 2, and 6 to 8.

Cunkelman describes a combination gas drying and reservoir apparatus. Fig. 3 of Cunkelman shows an embodiment of the apparatus having valves 280, 201, and 220. However, the reference does not describe that any of those valves are mounted externally of a housing. Nor does there appear to be any disclosure of a housing for the electrical circuits shown in the figure. The embodiment shown in Fig. 4 has two valves 290 and 221 which are connected to an electronic controller 250. However, the reference fails to disclose that the controller has a housing or that the valves are mounted to the controller housing so that they are mounted externally of the housing.

In contrast, the Applicant's claimed device as set forth in Claim 1 includes a housing within which an electronic control circuit is mounted. The Applicant's claimed device as set forth in Claim 1 also includes at least two valves which are provided with plugs or sockets that are adapted to cooperate with corresponding sockets or plugs in a wall of the housing such that "the valves are mounted on,